

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Title:

As requested by the Examiner, a new title has been supplied that is more descriptive of the claimed invention

Drawings:

The specification has been amended to clearly identify that the network is represented by reference numeral 20. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §1.12:

In response to the rejections of claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §1.112, second paragraph, those claims have been reviewed and amended to ensure compliance with 35 U.S.C. §1.112. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Art Rejections:

Claims 8-10 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,647,010, hereinafter referred to *Okubo*.

One of the objects of the present invention is to provide an inhibition control for an image processing system, wherein the inhibition pattern conforms with the image to be output, and can thus be used by a system to which a plurality of input devices are connected. Specifically, according to preferred embodiments of the

invention, the inhibition conditions or the input image data are capable of being modified to ensure conformance with each other.

With regard to claim 8, an image processor combination includes a memory device which stores output inhibition conditions for inhibiting print of an image including a specified pattern and a converter which converts the output inhibition conditions to detection parameters according to output characteristics of the image output device. The combination further includes a detector which detects the specified pattern in the input image data based on the detection parameters converted by the converter. Thus, the claimed converter converts the output inhibition conditions before the detector determines whether the input image data should be inhibited.

The Examiner alleges that *Okubo* teaches and suggests the subject matter of claim 8. However, as clearly indicated in Figure 9, the inhibition patterns are stored in ROM 901 and are fed directly to the pattern detection 110. *Okubo* does not teach or suggest any converter for converting the output inhibition conditions. *Okubo* does teach that the detection accuracy of the pattern detection can be changed. See column 11, lines 9-13. The detection accuracy is changed by storing parameters for changing the detection accuracy in the read only memory 901. See column 11, lines 18-36. Accordingly, it is clear that the parameters stored in the read only memory 901 are solely for the purpose of changing the detection accuracy of the pattern detection 110. There is no teaching or suggestion that the parameters that are changed relate to output characteristics of the system. Accordingly, *Okubo* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination which includes, among other elements, a

converter which converts the output inhibition conditions to detection parameters according to output characteristics of the image output device.

Claims 9, 10, and 12 depend from claim 8, and are thus also patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

Claim 13 defines an imaging processing system comprising an image processor that includes, among other elements, a converter which converts output inhibition conditions to detection parameters according to output characteristics of the image output device. As set forth above with respect to claim 8, such a converter is not taught or suggested by *Okubo*. Accordingly, claim 13 is also patentable over *Okubo*.

Claim 14 defines a method of processing input image data that includes, among other elements, converting the output inhibition conditions to detection parameters according to output characteristics of the image output device. And, claim 15 defines a computer-readable storage medium that includes a program that has the step of converting the output the output inhibition conditions to detection parameters according to output characteristics of the image output device. Accordingly, claims 14 and 15 are also patentable over *Okubo*.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okubo*. Claim 1 defines an image processor combination that includes, among other elements, two converters. The first converter converts the input image data to the first image data for image forming and the second converter converts the input image data to second image data in correspondence to a state of a print obtained by the image output device. The combination further includes a detector which detects the specified pattern in the second image data converted by

the second converter, based on the output inhibition condition stored in said memory device.

In contrast to claim 1, the scanned image data goes from the scanner 101 to the pattern detection 110 through the line thinning section 1302. However, it does not pass through any type of converter prior to reaching the pattern detection 110. The line thinning section 1302 in Figure 22 does not convert the input image data to second image data. It merely thins out lines of the data so they can form to the level of magnification selected by the system. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Okubo*.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and are thus also patentable over *Okubo*.

Claim 5 defines an image processing system combination that also includes first and second converters. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, *Okubo* does not teach a combination that includes a second converter which converts the input image data to second image data in correspondence to a state of a print obtained by the image output device.

Claim 6 defines method of processing input image data that includes, among other elements, two converting steps. The second converting step includes converting the input image data to second image data in correspondence to a state of a print obtained by the image output device.

Claim 7 defines a computer-readable storage medium that functions similarly to the method of claim 6. Accordingly, claims 6 and 7 are also patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okubo* as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,085, hereinafter *Sato*. The Examiner relies upon *Sato* for the teaching of a converter comprising a conversion table based on measurement values of color of the print. However, the portions relied upon by the Examiner in *Sato* do not overcome the deficiency of the rejection based on *Okubo*. Accordingly, claim 4 is also patentable over the applied prior art. Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okubo* as applied to claim 8, and further in view of *Sato*. However, claim 11 is patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 4 and 8.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections of the application.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 22, 2005

By: Elaine P. Specter R.W. 40,116
William C. Rowland
Sr. Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620